

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/19/2020 12:35:13 AM

First name: Lincoln

Last name: Post

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

Thank you for extending the comment period and working with the community to create a positive restoration project for the Twisp River watershed. I have lived-in the Twisp River watershed for 30 years 17 of them above Buttermilk and as a result have spent a great deal of time in the ares of this proposal. Even with my familiarity it would be nearly impossible to comment on the scope and scale of this proposal without a great deal more time.

The scale of this project proposal is too large. I suggest breaking it into smaller components that make sense on the landscape and would allow for more informed comments. Each smaller project could then have a shorter timeframe for completion and evaluation.

There are important aspects in this proposal to improve forest health, fire safety, and hydrologic health but there also many red flags as well. One concern for example is the inmpact to the LSR and owl habitat zones. There are areas of the LSR in the upper Twisp River corridor where it is hard to find a stump or evidence of historic logging. As a result there is an impressive original forest habitat that needs to have a very light touch. In essence all that is needed is light hand thinning to release the old growth from the fire suppressed growth which will either cause mortality from drought stress or ladder fuel in a stand replacing fire. When I read the fine print of trees being removed up to 25dbh the impacts from the infrastructure required to log such large trees and the damage caused would far out weigh the benefits. I know that the proposal has qualifying elements but it implies logging in areas that should have only light thinning of small diameter trees. this is just one example of concerns raised by your proposal.

Please remove the ATV use from your restoration proposal. ATV use should be a separate plan and proposal.

What has happened is that the positive elements in the proposal are overshadowed by all the questions raised by the scale of the plan and its potential to do more harm than good. I am in favor of forest restoration, fire safety thinning, and river habitat improvements. It is too important not to get this plan right. Please break this large plan into smaller plans and have more community involvement in the process